





# RADIO BROADCASTING— A PROFESSION

BY JUSTIN MILLER

PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS

*An address delivered before the Twenty-Sixth Annual Convention of the National Association of Broadcasters, at Los Angeles, California, on May 17, 1948.*



For some time, the broadcasters of America have been preoccupied with Standards of Practice. After several experimental years, the members of our Association—by an almost unanimous referendum vote—empowered the Board of Directors to adopt appropriate standards and take necessary steps to secure observance of them. Last September, the Board brought to the Convention a proposed draft of Standards; which were there analyzed and discussed, with no punches pulled. The Board then gave consideration to suggested changes; it adopted the Standards in principle, but invited additional suggestions and objections, and announced that all would be weighed carefully, before the Standards were put into effect. During the last six months, there has been widespread discussion of the proposals; many changes have been made; extensive restyling has taken place; many members and officers of the Association have participated in the process. Now, we will have opportunity, again, for full consideration at this Convention. There will be no more important subject presented for your consideration.

Let me emphasize, again, that in spite of your delegation of power, the Board has proceeded with great care and deliberation, and has no intention of doing otherwise in the future. This is not the kind of work

which should be done hastily. Robert Louis Stevenson's maxim<sup>1</sup> that "Nothing should be done in a hurry which can be done slowly" has been particularly pertinent.

There are those who have feared delay because they know that good salesmanship requires striking "*while the iron is hot*"; that a sale may be lost by timidity or shyness at the psychological moment; that it is necessary to go forward quickly to the desired culmination, as in the case of the famous Southern General who said that he won battles because he got there "*fustest with the mostest men*." The importance of speed techniques, as applied to salesmanship and to war, may readily be admitted, but it must be recognized and understood that what we are doing here is building upon foundations which have been laid by professional people who have gone before us; that we are laying new and additional foundations for those who will follow us. We will discover that standard setting is a long, continuing process, which begins slowly and moves slowly; shaping rules and regulations to the facts of life, as we live through various types of experience. We will discover, also, that people react in various ways to this process. Some have a natural instinct for affirmative action; some are carried along by the enthusiasm of others; some are inclined to drag reluctant feet; and a few, if we are not careful, may actually pour sand into the gears. We will be much more likely to secure cooperative acceptance by all, if all understand the objective which we seek to achieve and feel that they have a real part in it. Such a project, hastily done, and more or less forced upon some of those who are affected by it, invites criticism, invites opposition, and, sometimes, destroys itself as a result.

It is important that we recognize our undertaking as one of professional character; that in adopting standards of practice, we are assuming a professional status. What is it, after all, that distinguishes a profession from a trade or business? Clearly, there is much in common between them. In both we find skilled craftsmen; in both there are special vocabularies and special techniques. In both we find associations for advancing the individual proficiency of the members and the collective prosperity of the whole group. They are not to be distinguished on these grounds. Again, most professional groups are subject to governmental licensing. A lawyer, for example, must be formally examined and licensed to practice. If he violates the conditions of his license—express or implied—he may be disbarred. The same is true of physicians, dentists, teachers and others. In this respect, therefore, we find an identity between broadcasters and the established professions. But, many others who are *not* professionals must be licensed also; practically all trades, in some

---

<sup>1</sup> "The Morality of the Profession of Letters", *Fortnightly Review* April 1881, STEVENSON'S WORKS, Vol. 7, pp. 433, 441, P. F. Collier & Son Edition (1912).

states. So we must look beyond this point of identification.

Of course, the real question is, what are the *common characteristics of recognized professional groups which are different from those of non-professional groups*. Most people assume that lawyers, physicians and ministers are members of professions, just because tradition classifies them as such. However, during recent years, we have seen a wide expansion of the classification. A recent publication entitled "*Statutory Status of Six Professions*" lists Accountancy, Architecture, Law, Medicine, Nursing, Teaching. It is customary to think, also, of engineers, dentists, journalists, musicians, actors, and a number of others, as falling within the professional category. Certainly, it should be a challenge to broadcasters to inquire why these groups are any more entitled to professional prestige than they. In other words, what does an accountant, an engineer, a nurse, or a teacher have that a broadcaster does not?

It has been suggested by some that the distinction lies in the attitude of the professional man toward his work. One writer<sup>2</sup> expressed the idea in these terms: "*The difference between industry, as it exists today, and a profession is, then, simple and unmistakable. The essence of the former is that its only criterion is the financial return which it offers to its shareholders. The essence of the latter is that, though men enter it for the sake of a livelihood, the measure of their success is the service which they perform, not the gains which they amass. They may, as in the case of a successful doctor, grow rich; but the meaning of their profession, both for themselves and for the public, is not that they make money, but that they make health, or safety, or knowledge, or good law. They depend on it for their income, but they do not consider that any conduct which increases their income is on that account good.*" Perhaps this is unnecessarily rough on the businessman; perhaps it gives too much credit to the professions. Certainly, it fails to distinguish between individuals in both groups. But let us use the statement—by way of hypothesis—to describe the attitudes of the two groups, generally.

Now, what of the broadcaster? Does he consider that any conduct which increases his income is on that account good? Or, is he concerned with the happiness, the knowledge, the welfare of the people? The question answers itself. So far, no one has raised any objection to the statement in our proposed Standards, which reads: "That it is our obligation to serve the people in such manner as to reflect credit upon our profession and to encourage aspiration toward a better estate for all mankind; by making available to every person in America, such programs as will perpetuate the traditional leadership of the United States in all phases of the broadcasting art."

---

<sup>2</sup> R. H. Tawney, author of "The Acquisitive Society", quoted in the ANNALS OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF POLITICAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCE, May 1922.

But, I would carry the distinction between business and profession one step farther. Not only the attitude of the professional man himself is important, but the attitudes of all concerned. What does the physician's patient think of the relationship? What of the lawyer's client? And what do people, generally, think?

Let us assume that a person employs a physician, or a lawyer, or a minister; tells him the most intimate secrets of his life or business, and asks for professional service, based upon his knowledge of a highly specialized professional science. Suppose then, the professional man should broadcast the person's troubles at a cocktail party, or blackmail him, as the price of secrecy concerning his weaknesses; or sell his secrets to an adversary; or give him shabby, dishonest shyster service, or prescribe poison, instead of appropriate drugs; would the person have cause for complaint? Would the fact that the professional man might be able to hide his misconduct behind his professional mystery, beyond the reach of the law, excuse the misconduct?

Certainly, everyone, except the most depraved minority would join in condemning such a professional man. Ninety-nine per cent of professional group members would wince in shame at the public disrepute which such misconduct brings upon a profession, and would agree that their voluntarily imposed and voluntarily observed standards of practice should discountenance it.

The distinction is pointed up, sharply, in the legal maxim, long applied to the business world, *Caveat emptor*—Let the buyer beware. The theory of this maxim was that buyer and seller were equally matched; they stood at arms length and dealt with each other as experience and sharp wits required. No one would think of requiring strict standards of ethics to govern equally-matched participants in a horse trade. We have all smiled, indulgently, over the technique of David Harum in disposing of his balking horse to the "deakin." But, everyone would assume that a parent, in dealing with a child, or a guardian, with a ward, would be more than careful to avoid taking advantage of the ignorance or lack of experience of the one who relied so implicitly upon him. Business transactions generally savor of the horse trade; professional relations generally resemble the fiduciary relationship of parent and child. The professional person, indeed, is of the priesthood, familiar with the mystery of his calling, and charged with the duty of administering to the welfare of the uninitiated.

Now, let us turn, again, to the broadcasters. Do they stand at arms length with their listeners; are both evenly matched, equally able to protect themselves? Obviously not! Oh, of course, the listener can turn off the radio! So can the owner of a horse lock the barn door after the horse is stolen. What of the bits of obscenity, which a particular performer

customarily ingratiate into his program; what of the repulsive commercial which follows, without a break, a delightful interlude of music; what of the horrible agonies and excruciating torments; the blueprints of crime which some strivers after Hooperatings are willing to broadcast? Are the complaints of parents, teachers, police, juvenile authorities, all without merit? I have no desire to dwell on unpleasant subjects. You are just as anxious as anyone to remove all just cause for complaint. The question is, how best to do so.

The broadcaster stands in the same position, faces the same problems, and has available to him, the same remedies as other professional groups, including the promulgation and observance of standards. The broadcaster, like other professionals, has a specialized field of knowledge; he has special skills in programming to fit the needs of his community. He knows how to balance and reconcile the interests of many different groups of listeners, of advertisers, of networks, of public officials, of political, religious, fraternal and civic groups. Do you know any professional man who is required to have more widely diversified and specialized knowledge, and to use more specialized skills, in the many delicate adjustments of his professional activities to the people he serves? Do you know any professional man who is charged with more important discretionary powers under the law, or with a more important obligation to serve the public interest, the public convenience and the public necessity? Do not the attitudes of all concerned—broadcaster, listener, the public, the government—coincide in assuming a professional relationship which is in every respect as important as that of accountant, engineer, nurse, teacher, journalist, dentist, physician, lawyer? Can we escape the conclusion that broadcasters, like other newly developed professional groups which I have mentioned, are holding themselves out as qualified and willing to perform services which involve the trustful reliance of those for whom such services are performed? Whether we all realize it, or not, gentlemen, that is the situation.

Perhaps some broadcasters fear that—in saying we need self-regulation through standards of practice—we are admitting guilt or losing “face”. They need have no such fear. Every professional group, every business group has met the same problem. Those with most “face” and *greatest* prestige are the ones which have gone farthest and established the highest standards. Indeed, if we were deliberately seeking association with the most *disreputable* groups, we would go to the ones which have refused to admit the need for self-regulation. Moreover, the professional and business groups which insist upon the highest standards and enjoy the greatest prestige are the ones which go farthest, not only in observance, but in enforcement, as well.

Some have suggested that to adopt standards of practice is merely to impose penal laws upon ourselves, when we should be fighting against

adverse legislation. This argument completely misconceives the nature and purpose of such standards. Penal laws are made to coerce the vicious or inadequate, criminals, persons at the bottom of the moral and intellectual scale of society, who lack capacity to make and observe standards of conduct for themselves.

Standards of practice and canons of ethics, on the other hand, invite and stimulate cooperative effort; they are the crystallization of beliefs, the expression of ideals; they strengthen and inspire the activities of natural leaders; they set up a banner—as it were—around which honest, well-intentioned men can rally; which may be used to educate those who are less experienced and those of lesser faith, those who have not yet caught the spark of enthusiasm and of inspiration which puts the welfare of their families, their communities—the happiness of all the people—above the miserable aspirations of selfishness.

Penal laws chafe and irritate free, independent, intelligent people, because they suggest viciousness and inadequacy where it does not exist. Standards of practice, voluntarily adopted and observed, eliminate the demand for penal legislation, because intelligent people in other groups know that such standards—expressing the ideals and desires of fair-minded people—will accomplish more, in the long run, than oppressive laws which invite evasion and avoidance.

A writer<sup>3</sup> upon this subject has said, recently: “*It is idle to assume that the overwhelming majority, composed of persons who are not guilty of these things, refrain only from fear of punishment. No police-system could possibly be effective enough to keep any large minority in prison, if this large minority had a strong impulse to disregard the penal laws. We must suppose that the majority—the great majority—of citizens abstain from theft and swindling because they have lost any strong impulse to increase their property in this way. In most cases, we may assign the change to a social habit that is begun early in childhood by the pressure of established customs, rather than by specific precepts.*”

In other words, there are great values to be achieved from standards of practice, quite apart from legal sanctions, or methods of enforcement. The fact that we fail, sometimes—or even that others fail more frequently—in observance of them, does not make them valueless. Some of the greatest compulsions of life—and some of the greatest satisfactions—come from the striving for such ideals, in association with our fellows, in communities, churches, clubs and in other social and professional groups.

When men sit down to play a game of gin-rummy, they take perfectly for granted the rules of the game which govern the playing. Natu-

---

<sup>3</sup> MANNERS AND MORALS OF BUSINESS, Max Radin, p. 251.

rally, this cramps the style of the one who would play by his own rules. It was considered proper in frontier days to shoot the "card sharp" on discovery. Today, lesser means of discipline are used. But, there is no appeal to "law" for redress; neither do the players shrug their shoulders, futilely and say, "*What's the use; it can't be helped.*" What is the sanction in such a situation? In other words, what makes the rules of the game effective and self-enforcing?

There is no "law" which compels obedience to the rules, when college teams play football, but there are moral, ethical, traditional and customary compulsions and sanctions, nevertheless, which operate to secure ninety-nine percent compliance and to enforce the edicts of the umpire and referee in the other one percent. So it is with standards, as contrasted with penal laws.

All this reveals the essence of that subtle fusion of human characteristics which I call the professional spirit. John H. Sorrells, writing of the profession of journalism, expressed my idea in these words:<sup>4</sup> ". . . *the newspaper is more than a business or a trade or a profession; it's a way of life.* \* \* \* *what counts is a man's own concept of the obligations inherent in it.* \* \* \* *The law is a noble profession. So is medicine and the profession of arms.* \* \* \* *There are, of course, cowards and traitors among soldiers. There are quacks among the doctors, and shysters among lawyers. There are also newspaper 'merchants' with pawnbroker souls.* But for every quack, there are a hundred sincere and honest doctors whose lives are dedicated in self-denial and compassion to healing the sick. For every shyster, there are a hundred earnest lawyers dedicated to the preservation of an orderly society and the securing of justice for the common man. And for every journalistic sharper, there are a hundred sincere newspapermen whose primary determination, whose fiercest instinct, is to serve, to improve the society in which they live."

Of course, there are limits to the possibilities which may be expected of standards. In the first place, there is an absolute limit beyond which standards cannot go—or penal laws either—without destroying the subject to which they are applied. If success cannot be achieved by any broadcaster except by practices which some critics urge should be condemned, then, obviously, the practices cannot be condemned. Nothing could be accomplished by pious protestations beyond all possibility of achievement, except to convince the people that those who proposed them were frauds and hypocrites. Obviously, they would not receive support from anyone, including their promulgators.

Even if some suggested standards would be entirely feasible for a large percentage of broadcasters, it may be unwise to impose them,

nevertheless. Profitable, forbidden practices would be used by marginal operators—especially in times of business stress—to gain an unfair competitive advantage over those who did observe the standards. The result would be that others—who, normally, would comply with the standards—would be induced to follow suit. For example, Max Gardner, former Governor of North Carolina and a cotton mill operator, once told me that the need for child labor laws resulted from the refusal of fifteen percent of the mill owners to comply with the desire of the other eighty-five percent to eliminate child labor, voluntarily. It would be foolish to adopt, even highly desirable standards, if they were so strict as to leave no alternative but violation, in self-defense against unfair competition.

This consideration is particularly important, just now, because of the substantial number of marginal operators who are, or will be, so close to the line between black and red, as to make it difficult for them to survive on a high standard of performance. These people are entitled to our sympathy and consideration. Many of them were persuaded to apply for licenses by exaggerated estimates of broadcasters' profits, which were issued from governmental sources. In fact, estimates which were released—indicating that one could build and operate a station upon a \$10,000 or \$12,000 outlay—constituted a cruel misrepresentation which, if it had come from private rather than from governmental sources, might well have resulted in governmental prosecution. It is unreasonable to expect that these persons could voluntarily participate in a program of self-regulation and self-discipline which would destroy the possibility of their own successful operation. Indeed, if the normal curve of business failures occurs in broadcasting, a certain percentage of them will drop out anyway. Perhaps when that adjustment has taken place, the broadcasters may then decide to stiffen the standards, accordingly.

The difficulty in adopting adequate standards of practice is even more apparent because we are working so largely in an area of good taste, as contrasted with areas in which the law usually operates. What constitutes good taste and bad taste, varies decidedly with different people. In music, in literature, in entertainment, in controversial discussion, we must cover the whole wide range of possibilities—from the sublime to the ridiculous—if we are to satisfy the normal appetites of our people. Who shall say which is better or worse?

Even our staid and typically British critic, the BBC, gets into amusing difficulties from time to time. One of the *New York Times* London correspondents<sup>5</sup> described such an incident, concerning the broadcast of a Spanish bullfight. It was given as part of a program which lasted for an hour and a half, describing Easter festivities, both religious and general, in Denmark, Greece, Austria, Spain, and Italy. Soon after

---

<sup>5</sup> L. Marsland Gander, THE LONDON LETTER, *New York Times*, August 17, 1947, p. X-7.

the broadcast, the "humanitarians" sued for an injunction to restrain BBC from broadcasting the program again. The court dismissed the motion for an injunction and BBC re-broadcast the whole program, "this time on the sacred and serious Third program wave lengths." Then, miracle of miracles, George Bernard Shaw, in a letter to the *Daily Telegraph*, called for an inquiry into the mental condition of BBC. As the correspondent commented, "*Mr. Shaw's own works, have, for his own purposes, dealt with a number of most unpleasant and barbaric subjects, not excluding the burning at the stake of Joan of Arc.*" Just how inconsistent, even ludicrous, people may become when they attempt to become censors of people's tastes is well illustrated by this performance. We are fortunate that we have no BBC in control of broadcasting here. We hope we will have no government censor of the tastes of our people; and we should pray for guidance in our own efforts to set standards in this difficult area.

Again, with respect to this matter of taste, our standards should be drawn with sufficient flexibility, not only to *permit*, but to *encourage*, experimentation. Our achievements have come, largely, from willingness to permit adventures into unconventional areas. Frequently, the experimenter gets his fingers burned or his ears slapped down, but, occasionally, he turns up with a new and valuable technique. Our critics, who most volubly cry for such new and better techniques, are, of course, the first to complain bitterly of experiments which do not succeed. How far would a laboratory scientist get if he had to put up with a chorus of strident complainers and jeremiads, who would break forth in lamentations and execrations whenever an experiment went wrong?

In expressing these necessary limitations, I have no intention of suggesting the adoption of ineffective or weaseling standards of practice. After giving full consideration to all phases of the problem, we must speak with such assurance and certainty that all can understand. Moreover, I have no intention of giving comfort to those small groups of individualists who do not believe in team play under any circumstances. They are like the prima donnas who want to carry the ball on every play; or, conversely, those who would abolish sports altogether. One of these is the smugly complacent and self-satisfied man who rejects every suggestion that he—or any other broadcaster—could possibly do wrong; he pours cold water on every plan for improvement; he seeks, constantly, to undercut and back-track; he waxes eloquent and at great length, in reciting the many virtues of his fellows, and the accomplishments of the great men of the past. Closely related to him—although he would scorn the association—is that other canny individualist who prefers to skim the cream of meretricious profits, so long as possible; risking public disfavor; inviting more and more restrictive regulation and legislation; building up trouble and harassment for all broadcasters in the years to come.

These men are unable to understand that the alternative to self-regulation is government regulation and, perhaps, government broadcasting itself; this, in spite of practically worldwide government operation, or close regulation of broadcasting everywhere except in the United States. Apparently, these men have been unaware of repeated legislative proposals for greater government control of broadcasting in this country; of *Mayflower* doctrines, of *Port Huron* cases; of Blue Book extravaganzas; of impossible programming promises of applicants, stimulated by these legislative and administrative forays.

If you need assurance on the subject, I can tell you that there are still plenty of possibilities for legislative limitations of broadcasting on both Federal and state levels; short of the grosser encroachments which I have been fighting, since I became your President. And, there are legislative and administrative devices for by-passing the Constitutional guarantees upon which I have been relying.

The Food and Drug Act, the Sherman Anti-trust law, the Federal Trade Commission Act, and the whole congeries of regulatory agencies and legislation which have come swarming after them, are good examples of what happens to people who are unwilling or unable to regulate their own conduct. Most recently, we have seen a wrathful people pull down the insolent and racketeering labor czars, with such legislation as the Lea Act and the Taft-Hartley Act. This, then, is our choice: To demonstrate, convincingly, that we are able and willing to do, as other professional groups have done before us, all that we can "to clean our own house", or to suffer the type of coercive controls which are visited upon the inadequate and the recalcitrant. Quibbling and sophistry will get us nowhere. We either keep our eye on the ball, or we lose control of the play. There is no more convincing way to do this than by the adoption, acceptance and observance of standards of practice, which appeal to all concerned, as a fair harmonizing of the ideal, on the one hand, and the realistic, down-to-earth necessities of practical, successful broadcasting, on the other.

Already we have seen evidences of changing attitudes upon the part of our erstwhile critics. Our relationships with the FCC and other government contacts are much healthier and there is far greater understanding by them, of broadcasters and their problems. While caustic newspaper comment and slanted magazine articles still appear, occasionally, generally speaking our work on the Standards has been accepted in good faith by the rival media, and favorable comment is well mixed with the unfavorable. We still hear of pressures exerted by advertisers for third-grade scripts, but we are getting wholehearted commendation and assurance that we are moving in the right direction, from responsible leaders among the advertisers and agencies.

Of course, this does not mean that the advertisers and agencies will be happy with every conclusion upon which *we* may agree. It is, of course, desirable that so far as possible, we secure understanding in advance and adherence in principle, rather than that there be conflict between these several groups. To secure such understanding and adherence with respect to the standards, we have been maintaining working relations with the ANA and AAAA. To this end, several meetings have been held with representatives of these groups, at which discussions have taken place concerning both the underlying principles and specific suggestions as to particular standards. I am happy to report that we have found a cordial willingness upon the part of these representatives and an apparent readiness to harmonize their views with those of the broadcasters, to the best interests of all.

During the work of preparation, the question of enforcement of the Standards has come constantly to the fore. We cannot keep this out of the minds of those who are to be affected by the code. It must be recognized, clearly, that there are definite limitations upon methods of enforcement of standards, voluntarily accepted by licensees who, under the law, are solely responsible for the way in which their stations operate. When the members of the Association adopted the By-law which empowered the Board to act with respect to standards, they used the word "*observance*" rather than "*enforcement*." When the standards have been put into final form and adopted, I shall suggest to the Board that a special committee of representative broadcasters be constituted, for the purpose of reviewing all possible methods for securing "*observance*." In this respect, as in the preparation of standards, it is much more important that we proceed wisely, than that we proceed hastily. In this respect, as in the preparatory stage, we must be guided by experience and experimentation.

Our present task—and we should give it our single-minded attention—is to be sure that the Standards which we prepare and adopt are as near perfect as possible; as nearly adapted as possible to meet our needs, and the needs of the people whom we serve. We have a *greater* obligation, in doing this, than many of the professions to which I have referred, because of the fact that broadcasters control a great medium of communication, and are the protectors of one of the greatest freedoms enjoyed by the American people.

Against this background, it becomes obvious that unwillingness to adopt and observe standards would necessarily imply a lack of sufficient maturity to understand the nature of the professional spirit and lack of capacity to assume its responsibilities. I would be the last to condemn any particular broadcaster for such inadequacies. After all, many of the stimuli which prepare members of other groups for professional consciousness and activity, are absent in the case of broadcasting. So far,

the formal educational processes—such as are provided by the schools of law, medicine, engineering, journalism, nursing, accountancy—have not been developed for broadcasting. So far, the customary background of professional science has not been established in texts and treatises. We lack the prestige enjoyed by other professional groups in community, state and national life. We are surprised when we discover our own potentialities; we are not only cautious, but shy and timid in asserting our power and influence in public places and before public agencies.

Perhaps a few of us would be willing, even happy, to assume the role of carriers of freight and express—peddling packaged goods—if by doing so we could be *relieved* of professional responsibilities. Perhaps a few of us are tempted to squirm guiltily, and admit every charge which the cynics, the satirists, and the rival media gaily toss our way, rather than stand up and toss them back again. Where the lawyers, journalists, or physicians would rise in angry protest and swarm down upon an over-reaching government agency, we are inclined to acquiesce. After all, we are still—to a considerable extent—a heterogeneous aggregation of individuals, while other professional groups enjoy the confidence and stability which comes from centuries of tradition and cooperative action.

But all this makes it even more important that we come of age, professionally. By thinking and acting as professional people do, we come sooner to the maturity which must be achieved. It is not necessary to wait for centuries to pass in order to obtain such professional consciousness and capacity. It was not necessary to wait centuries for the scientific development and exploitation of the basic discoveries which made broadcasting possible. There are plenty of broadcasters who are, as individuals, professionally mature, and capable of expanding the professional side of our development, just as quickly and convincingly as was done by the physical scientists. It is time to act. We have deliberated long enough. If the draft of Standards which is submitted to you is not a fairly balanced product, let us put it quickly into shape and into operation. I have full faith and confidence that you will do so.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> The Standards of Practice were approved and adopted on May 18, 1948, effective July 1, 1948.



NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS  
1771 N STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON 6, D.C.

**Comments**  
1. A clear understanding is desired to insure the radio station is given the right to use the radio station in a manner that reflects the quality of service in the business of radio advertising.  
2. The station should offer the program quality as an all round service.  
3. The station should offer the program quality as an all round service.  
4. The station should offer the program quality as an all round service.  
5. The station should offer the program quality as an all round service.  
6. The station should offer the program quality as an all round service.  
7. The station should offer the program quality as an all round service.  
8. The station should offer the program quality as an all round service.  
9. The station should offer the program quality as an all round service.  
10. The station should offer the program quality as an all round service.  
11. The station should offer the program quality as an all round service.  
12. The station should offer the program quality as an all round service.  
13. The station should offer the program quality as an all round service.  
14. The station should offer the program quality as an all round service.  
15. The station should offer the program quality as an all round service.  
16. The station should offer the program quality as an all round service.  
17. The station should offer the program quality as an all round service.  
18. The station should offer the program quality as an all round service.  
19. The station should offer the program quality as an all round service.  
20. The station should offer the program quality as an all round service.  
21. The station should offer the program quality as an all round service.  
22. The station should offer the program quality as an all round service.  
23. The station should offer the program quality as an all round service.  
24. The station should offer the program quality as an all round service.

**Program and Other**

1. The details of approved offers should be made available to the client.  
2. The details of approved offers should be made available to the client.  
3. The details of approved offers should be made available to the client.  
4. The details of approved offers should be made available to the client.  
5. The details of approved offers should be made available to the client.  
6. The details of approved offers should be made available to the client.  
7. The details of approved offers should be made available to the client.  
8. The details of approved offers should be made available to the client.  
9. The details of approved offers should be made available to the client.  
10. The details of approved offers should be made available to the client.  
11. The details of approved offers should be made available to the client.  
12. The details of approved offers should be made available to the client.  
13. The details of approved offers should be made available to the client.  
14. The details of approved offers should be made available to the client.  
15. The details of approved offers should be made available to the client.  
16. The details of approved offers should be made available to the client.  
17. The details of approved offers should be made available to the client.  
18. The details of approved offers should be made available to the client.  
19. The details of approved offers should be made available to the client.  
20. The details of approved offers should be made available to the client.  
21. The details of approved offers should be made available to the client.  
22. The details of approved offers should be made available to the client.  
23. The details of approved offers should be made available to the client.  
24. The details of approved offers should be made available to the client.

Scanned from the National Association of Educational Broadcasters Records  
at the Wisconsin Historical Society as part of  
"Unlocking the Airwaves: Revitalizing an Early Public and Educational Radio Collection."



A collaboration among the Maryland Institute for Technology in the Humanities,  
University of Wisconsin-Madison Department of Communication Arts,  
and Wisconsin Historical Society.

Supported by a Humanities Collections and Reference Resources grant from  
the National Endowment for the Humanities



MARYLAND INSTITUTE FOR  
TECHNOLOGY IN THE HUMANITIES



WISCONSIN  
HISTORICAL  
SOCIETY



WISCONSIN  
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON



Any views, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this publication/collection do not necessarily reflect those of the National Endowment for the Humanities.